

83-0311/103

20 OCT 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Safety Staff, DDA

45-8

VIA: Associate Deputy Director for Administration

FROM:

[Redacted]

STAT

Deputy Chief, New Building Project Office, OL

SUBJECT: Thirty-five Percent Design Review

REFERENCE: Memo for C/NBPO/OL Through ADDA from C/SS/DDA  
dated 12 Oct 83, Subject: 35% Design Plans for the  
New Addition to Headquarters Building (DD/A 83-0311/99)

1. Safety Staff Review comments on the 35% Design Submission have been reviewed by the A-E, General Services Administration (GSA) Safety Staff, and New Building Project Office (NBPO), and there is uniform agreement that the applicable comments do not have a major impact on the project.

2. The following comments reference the itemized comments of your memorandum dated 12 October 1983.

- 1.a.(1) Eighteen units of exit width have been provided based upon an occupancy load of [Redacted] Office areas were calculated at [Redacted] sf/person and major mechanical/storage areas at [Redacted] sf/person.
- 1.a.(2) Safety Staff was advised on 7 October 1983 that these exits are identified for the existing building and not the New Headquarters.
- 1.a.(3) Since there is no assumed combined exit flow from corridors, the egress corridors are correctly sized.
- 1.a.(4) Do not concur that this additional door is required. Emergency egress is certainly better without this added door.
- 1.a.(5) Technically correct, but in the practical sense, the design as shown is appropriate.
- 1.a.(6) Door and corridor width will be shown on the construction documents.
- 1.b.(1) Safety Staff was advised on 7 October 1983 that this space and the door exits will not be defined until fit-up design.
- 1.b.(2) Door should remain to provide communication with other floor. Door is not intended for through traffic.

STAT  
STAT

OL 2112-83

SUBJECT: Thirty-five Percent Design Review

- 1.b.(3) Atrium as designed meets code requirements.
- 1.b.(4) Ground Floor is the point of discharge for these stairs, and this item would create two points of discharge for each set of stairs, which is undesirable and not required by code.
- 1.b.(5) Corridors are adequate as shown.
- 1.b.(6) Design assumes that joint evacuation of both buildings is unlikely and roof of loading dock is available as holding area if necessary. NBPO and GSA directed A-E to delete proposed stair at loading dock roofs.
- 1.c.(1) Exit units have been provided for  people, which is more than the code requirement for  people.
- 1.c.(2) Technically correct, but in the practical sense, the design as shown is appropriate.
- 1.d.(1) Twenty-six units of exit have been provided to meet the identical code requirement.
- 1.d.(2) Since 2-1/2 units of exit are required and 3 units have been provided, the design is correct.
- 1.e. GSA Safety Staff and NBPO do not concur with Agency Safety Staff on the interpretation of the code with respect to exit through an atrium. It is important to note here that at the Fourth Floor the only opening to the atrium is that of the escalator.
- 1.f. Eight units of exit have been provided, not 7 as calculated by Safety Staff.
- 1.g. Since this is an equipment only area, only one stair has been provided. A second exit to the roof is also provided.
- 2.a. This information is typically shown on the Construction Documents, not on the Preliminary Design.
- 2.b. Please advise how this can be accomplished operationally without backing up the trash chutes.
- 2.c. This information is typically shown on the Construction Documents, not on the Preliminary Design.
- 2.d. Concur.

STAT  
STAT

SUBJECT: Thirty-five Percent Design Review

- 2.e. Safety Staff was advised on 7 October 1983 that these exits will be located during fit-up design.
- 2.f. Concur.
- 2.g. Safety Staff was advised on 7 October 1983 that these exits will be located during fit-up design.
- 2.h. This is a component-supplied item, not a construction element.
- 2.i. Concur.
- 2.j. This area is for storage of film and photo developing material. Please advise code restrictions.
- 3.a. Safety Staff has been advised several times that Halon is not required by code and is not recommended by the GSA Safety Staff or the majority of the using components.
- 3.b. Safety Staff has been advised several times that the A-E is researching a seamless material to cover the raised flooring in this area. It was our understanding that Safety Staff was willing to consider the recommendations.
- 3.c. The fire pumps will indeed be located within the building and will be shown on the Construction Documents.
- 3.d. No pressure reducing valves have been shown or considered on the main water lines feeding the fire hydrants and pumps. In fact, the GSA Safety Staff and NBPO have been questioning for some time a current Headquarters construction project that would install a reducing valve at the route 123 entrance in front of the fire hydrants and pumps.

3. As usual, we remain ready to discuss any safety issue with you or your representatives.

STAT

Distribution:

Orig - Adse  
~~1~~ - ADDA  
1 - D/OL  
1 - OL/NBPO (Official)  
1 - Art Carlucci, GSA

OL/NBPC



(20 Oct 83)

STAT